

bodies won't cave in to political pressures being exerted.

One thing appears certain: The liberal media will likely get behind such an effort.

In any event, Mr. President, the Kinston, NC, Daily Free Press published an excellent article on July 16 written by a gentleman who knows whereof he speaks—Dr. Richard G. McDonald of Kinston who for more than 50 years has been working with homosexuals. Dr. McDonald has a clear understanding of what is going on even if the vast majority of U.S. Senators do not.

In any event, Mr. President, I want Dr. McDonald's observations to be made available to Senators and others who may have concerns about the obvious powerplay going on among U.S. homosexuals. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the published comments of Dr. McDonald be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kinston Free Press, July 16, 1995]
HOMOSEXUAL RIGHTS NEED CLEAR AND DIRECT DEBATE

(By Dr. Richard G. McDonald)

There has been an ongoing debate about gay rights, but the parameters of tolerance have not been addressed. This needs to be discussed clearly and directly.

There are tolerated limits and moral bounds to all human activity. There is a legal maxim that states, "Your right to swing your fist ends where my jaw begins." Self-explanatory. This is a line beyond which you may not proceed without dire consequence.

For over 50 years during and since WW II, I have been associated with, observed, supervised and counseled homosexuals; mostly male. Civil rights is something to which all people are entitled, regardless any other factor, i.e. jobs, housing, credit, etc., as a legal and moral right.

Most of us live our lives quietly and privately. Most homosexuals do also and enjoy successful lives interacting with society, in general, peaceably. There is a large number who, recognizing the inherent difficulty of their state, are involved in a serious effort to break away from what is unarguably abnormal and unnatural. They work closely with groups to this end; Exodus, nationally (with a N.C. unit) and Homosexual Anonymous, as in Maine (one of the groups with which I work).

These are troubled people who want to escape the clutches of their condition, knowing that it is a one-way road to nowhere; a nothingness to a tragic end and a sad death—if AIDS infected, a death sentence.

The state of their general equanimity, emotionally and psychologically, is disturbed, disordered, distressed, disabled; regrettable but largely correctable. In 1970-71 at two national conventions of the American Psychiatric Assoc. in San Francisco and Washington, homosexuality as a mental illness was removed from the Diagnostic Directory of Mental Illness under circumstances of coercion and intimidation that to this day are shameful and a professional disgrace. If you wonder why it was removed as a defined illness, you have only to read of the circumstances under which it was removed to realize that it never should have been.

There is, however, a radical and vociferous element within the homosexual community

who want it their way in all respects—such is their disturbed state, sadly. They press this agenda with an "in your face" approach and with scandalous public displays such as the parades and gay parties at Clinton's inauguration in D.C. and the gay pride parades nationally in general. (Pride in what?)

What this disturbed group wants is acceptance of their "lifestyle" with federal government blessing and protection as a "civil right" to promote their actions; to teach in our public schools that homosexuality is both natural and normal; to convince our youth that their lifestyle is merely an "alternative choice." To so convince and corrupt our youth would inevitably lead to a major breakdown in our social and moral order. Debauchery undermines the public moral fiber and the strength of people as a community and nation. This is precisely what led to the fall of great nations of the past; e.g. ancient Greece and Rome.

The moral reason for its rejection we all know. Causation is unknown to this day, scientifically. Predisposition to homosexuality is, no matter the cause, and will still be humanly abnormal and unnatural and should not be advanced to a government protected right. From time immortal, it has been rejected as unacceptable on the wisdom of thousands of years of human experience from the knowledge of consequences.

Because of their small numbers, despite their attempts to claim a large population, they are on a constant "recruiting campaign" to have a replacement base for their own purposes and to have available partners for their gratification. This applies to both genders though lesbians tend to have more personal, "caring and committed" relationship of longer duration.

But for both, their general attitude as it relates to human relations differs from that of the heterosexual majority significantly, in that it is inwardly directed in a self-centered matrix around gratification and the almost hysterical fear of aloneness without "partners." Sexual gratification is the motivating drive without the interconnectedness of "person," with the male. Most of the time, it is anonymous sex. The "bath houses" of San Francisco in the Castro district are the national hotbed of deviant gay sexuality and the center of the highest per capita AIDS infection rate in the nation. This is another sad consequence of homosexuality which is leading rapidly to a national epidemic; a fact that the AMA is ignoring and the Center for Disease Control does not want to admit; a serious warning to the American public is overdue.

Homosexual Congressman Steve Gunderson and his Gay Republican Caucus are solidly behind passage of the "Gay Bill of Rights" (H.R. 382 and Senate S. 25); further, they are busy lobbying for millions to fight for passage. To live their lives quietly and privately is one thing; to have a protected and special legal status is to give legitimacy to one of mankind's scourges. It must not happen for reasons that are indisputable; now you know what you must do.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? CONSIDER THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it does not take a rocket scientist to be aware that the U.S. Constitution forbids that any President spend even a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when a politician or an editor or a commentator pops off that "Reagan

ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress—a duty Congress cannot escape—to control Federal spending.

Thus, is it not the fiscal irresponsibility of Congress that has created the incredible Federal debt which stood at \$4,948,204,552.39 as of the close of business Friday, July 28?

This outrageous debt—which will be passed on to our children and grandchildren—averages out to \$18,783.46 for every man, woman, and child in America.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, in addition to the Minneapolis Star Tribune articles regarding the Federal judiciary circulated to Senators on Friday, July 28, I would like to share with my colleagues the following article, which was published on the op-ed page of the Star Tribune on Sunday, March 12, 1995.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SERIES WRONGED WEST AND JUDGES
(By Ruth E. Stanoch)

What could explain the character assassination the Star Tribune performed at the expense of the reputation of several U.S. Supreme Court justices, other distinguished federal jurists and the 6,000 employees of the West Publishing Co.? This is a question many people are asking after the Star Tribune wasted over eight pages of copy to prove a faulty premise, and then ran an editorial condemning allegations that the excruciatingly long articles never substantiated.

Cleverly linking unrelated events, the Star Tribune pulled quotes out of context and employed provocative tabloid language in lead headlines and paragraphs, only to suggest wrongdoing that its own handpicked panel of experts could not find.

The Star Tribune suggests as much in its own editorial. "All this might be just a minor eyebrow-raiser," state the editors, "if not for a question of timing."

Timing indeed. How is it that some 13 years after the creation of the Devitt Award—and after receiving press releases from West explaining every detail and identifying every recipient of this most distinguished award—that the Star Tribune finally woke up and destroyed half a forest in an effort to trash West and some highly respected federal judges? As the newspaper would have found from its own clips, the Devitt Award was started long before the West cases cited by the paper came before the U.S. Supreme Court, and it continues today, long after the cases have been resolved. If the issue is timing, it is the Star Tribune's timing that ought to be questioned.

The answer won't sell many newspapers, for there is no murky conspiracy or unfounded allegation of improper influence. In fact, the Star Tribune's effort to out-trigue Oliver Stone is merely the latest example of the bare-knuckled tussling that has become the norm in the fiercely competitive online information service sector.